



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Demosthenis Orationes. Edidit CAROLUS FUHR. Editio maior, Volumen I. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. Pp. xxxi+535. M. 4.50.

The Teubner text of Demosthenes has long been in need of a thoroughgoing revision. Blass's edition of 1884 embodied personal views that have not found general acceptance, some of which, indeed, the editor himself had materially changed before his death, some even as early as 1890, when he published his *Rede vom Kranze*. The most important of these views of Blass was his conviction that quotations from Demosthenes as found in Greek rhetoricians and grammarians often furnished a more ancient and reliable text than even the best MSS of the orator himself. Without sufficiently determining for each rhetorician whether or not he was accustomed to depend on memory for his quotations (a question that by no means admits a safe answer in some cases) and without sufficient critical apparatus for those authors, Blass ventured to make large use of these citations as evidence for the text of Demosthenes. The bad effects of this procedure needed to be eliminated from the Teubner text.

Again, Blass was so zealous in the application of the unquestioned principle of the avoidance of hiatus by Demosthenes, and the far less definite "rule" of the avoidance of a succession of three or more short syllables, that he frequently secured conformity to the principle and the rule by the acceptance of inferior manuscript testimony, and sometimes by pure conjecture. This procedure could not give a reliable text.

Still more serious was the damage wrought by Blass in the Teubner text by his attempt to secure in it the particular rhythmical movements and correspondences which at that time he believed he had discovered. The fact that he soon passed on to other rhythmical theories left his text of 1884 out of date even for himself, and in its use of rhythmical theory as a part of critical apparatus it met no acceptance whatever from other scholars.

In view of the great extent of the revision demanded, it is not surprising that Fuhr puts out the new text, not as a fifth edition of the old, but as a new work.

In his preface Fuhr briefly refers to the more recent discussions as to the original editions of Demosthenes' works and ancient revisions of them. He then gives in fifteen pages a description of the MSS, with references to the latest critical literature. He agrees with all scholars in holding S as of supreme authority, yet not infallible; he believes L to have been written from a MS that was itself a copy from S. A list of the papyrus fragments is added, with a brief statement of their small value as against the other MSS. He divides the MSS into three classes as against the four families of Butcher's Oxford text, for where Butcher makes P and Y members of a distinct family, Fuhr classes them with F. The plan of the Teubner texts allows Fuhr to give only brief critical notes. In ordinary cases he cites only the reading of

the leading member of each class, S, F, A; but under the sign V he often cites a reading on which F and Q agree. For the first four speeches, where A is only in small part available, because of its mutilation, he makes large use of U, citing from his own collation even insignificant variations and mistakes. He of course notes every variation of his own text from S, except in matters like elision and the ν movable. He records conjectures of modern scholars to some extent.

As to quotations in the rhetoricians and grammarians, Fuhr reminds us of the possibility that an ancient author was quoting in any given case from memory, or intentionally changing the phraseology; further, that when he did quote from his own copy of Demosthenes, there is even greater danger of the corruption of the text of these writers as transmitted to us than of the older and better MSS of Demosthenes; and, finally, that for many of these writers we have as yet no critical editions. He concludes: "Quae cum ita sint, testimoniis illis non multum tribuo, multo minus sophistarum imitationibus, quippe quos oratoris verba cum se imitando oratorem superare posse confiderent saepe ipsos mutasse credam" (p. xxv). Fuhr therefore quotes such testimony only occasionally, except in the case of Didymus, Dionysius, and Hermogenes; these authors, available in critical editions, he cites regularly.

In matters of hiatus and groups of short syllables two classes of cases are to be distinguished: first, there are very many cases where the hiatus would be removed, or the series of *breves* broken up, by the use of ordinary elision, aphaeresis, crasis, the use of ν movable (both before vowels and consonants), and especially by the marking of slight, but necessary, pauses. In another class of cases we have real hiatus or breves, removable only by alterations of the text that are more than formal. As to cases of the first class the editor of a critical text might take the position that these are cases to be managed in oral delivery, and that the printed text need not attempt to show these elisions, pauses, etc. Such an editor would content himself with printing the text of S *litteratim* (except as to pauses). But no recent editor takes this position, for the usage of S as to elision and the ν movable is so haphazard and inconsistent that it can claim no significance. We could not tolerate, e.g., such a text as S gives in 18. 197 $\sigma\upsilon\delta\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \xi\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ ($\sigma\upsilon\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\iota\theta'\ \xi\epsilon\rho'\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ Fuhr), or in 18. 224 $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\prime\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\phi'\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ($\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\ \delta'\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\prime\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau'\ \acute{\epsilon}\phi'\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ Fuhr), or in 18. 193 $\mu\eta\ \delta\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\mu\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\delta\omicron\ \theta\eta\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\chi\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\ \acute{\omicron}\sigma\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\iota\nu\omicron\nu\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ ($\mu\eta\ \delta\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\theta'\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\mu\prime\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\delta\omicron\ \theta\eta\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\chi\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\theta'\ \acute{\omicron}\sigma'\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\iota\nu\omicron\nu\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ Fuhr). Editors are agreed in holding S as of no authority in these matters, but they differ considerably in the extent to which they follow consistent principles of their own. With Fuhr's edition we naturally compare Goodwin's critical edition of the *De corona* (1901), Butcher's Oxford text (1903), which contains the same speeches as this first volume of Fuhr's (Speeches I–XIX), and Humphrey's *De corona* (1912), which, while not put

forth as a critical edition of the speech, gives in some respects the best text that we have. Goodwin seems to have given little attention to hiatus. He elides freely, beyond the elisions of S, but on no discernible principle; we find such needless cases of hiatus as ἀγῶνα Αἰσχίνου 3; πρᾶγμα αὐτὸ ἀναγκάζει and ἀγῶνα ἐνσθησάμενος 4 (but ἀγῶν' ἐμοί 5); τε ἰδίου 8; θεάσασθε ὡς βεβίωκα ἢ κοινὰ ὑπέρευν καταψηφίσασθε ἤδη ἐνδέδειχθε ἐπι 10. So inconsistent a text would be defensible only by an editor who was copying S throughout; this Goodwin does not do.

Butcher consistently elides to avoid hiatus; occasionally, however, where there is a distinct pause, yet a pause not sufficient in Butcher's judgment to warrant punctuation, he marks the pause by refraining from elision; some pauses of this sort are caused by the dwelling of the voice on an emphatic word (see Butcher's preface). The following are instances in the *De corona* (I have taken this speech for the more minute examination, as it is here that we have the editions of Goodwin and Humphreys for comparison): ἂ τότ' ὠνομάζοντο ἡνίκ' ἐδωροδόκουν 46; εἴτ' ἀληθῆ καὶ προσήκοντα εἶτε καὶ ψευδῆ 57; καὶ διὰ γε τοῦτο ὀρθῶς ἐπηνούμεν 113; ἐφ' οἷς δ' ἐστεφανούτο οὐχ ὑπεύθυνος 117; τὸν δ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι ταῦτ' ἀγῶνα ἕτεροι ἦσαν πεποιθμένοι 201; ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν ταῦθ', ὡς ἔοικε, τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πάτρια οὐδ' ἀνεκτὰ οὐδ' ἔμφυτα 203 (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν ταῦθ' ὡς ἔοικεν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις πάτρι' οὐδ' ἀνεκτὰ οὐδ' ἔμφυτα Fuhr [ἔοικε Humphreys]). So ψήφισμα ἢ 85; ἡγάπησα ἀντί 109; ὑμέτερα ἐξ 177; συμβόλαια ἐπὶ 210; νομίζονσα οὐδέ 238; λελητούργηκα ὑμῖν 267; ἐναντίωμα ἢ 308; βοήθεια ἢ 311. Butcher seems to have overlooked the need of elision in πρᾶγμα αὐτ' 4; κοινὰ ὑπέρευν 10; τοῦτο ὀρθῶς 113. As to hiatus as a factor in estimating the value of variant readings, Butcher says, "Deteriori igitur codici hiatum respuenti libentius obtemperamus quam meliori recipienti." So in 18. 142 he reads οὗτος ἐλάττων ὑποληφθῆ with the vulgate, where S has ὑποληφθῆ οὗτος ἐλάττων, with hard hiatus. (Goodwin tolerates the hiatus; Humphreys and Fuhr agree with Butcher in adopting the otherwise inferior reading in order to avoid it.)

Humphreys seldom fails to avoid hiatus where it can be done by elision. I have noted only the following cases: τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐτ' 4; δίκαια ἐννοικῶς 7; βεβίωκα ἢ 10; τοῦτό γε ἐν 21; ὠνομάζοντο ἡνίκ' 46; ἡδίκησθε ἐν 100; ἔδωκα ὑπεύθυνος 117; διδόμενα ὁμολογῶν 119; συμβάντα ἐν 168; ἀγαθὰ εἰς 213; ἕκαστα ἐγὼ 214.

Fuhr consistently removes hiatus by elision. In the *Crown Speech* I have noted only these exceptions: γιγνόμενα ἐπὶ 64; ἡδίκησθε ἐν 100; ταῦτα ὡς 170; ἐποίησα Εὐβοίας 237; λελητούργηκα ὑμῖν 267. In some of these cases there is sufficient pause to justify the hiatus. In three cases Fuhr removes hiatus by changing the order of words on inferior manuscript authority, or without authority: ἀγωνία πολλῇ for πολλῇ ἀγωνία of the MSS (S omits) 33; ἀπαρτᾶν ὑπολάβη (so Weil) for ὑπολάβη ἀπαρτᾶν of the MSS 59; τῇ πόλει λόγους ἐπαυρόμενος A (Butcher): τῇ πόλει ἐπαυρόμενος λόγους S, V, Y, Goodwin, Humphreys (222). On the other hand, in 12 Fuhr adopts an

interpretation that involves the bad hiatus *αὐτῇ ἐχθροῦ*, where Br. and Hs. with quite as good meaning have *αὐτῇ· ἐχθροῦ*. . . .

It is to be noted that Humphreys regularly leaves a vowel unelided before a comma, while Fuhr frequently elides, even where the pause is very distinct: Fuhr, *τούτους μὲν ἐχθροὺς ὑπολήψεσθ'*, *ἐμοὶ δὲ πιστεύετε* 40; *σχέτλιον γὰρ ἂν εἴη τοῦτο γ'*, *εἰ τῷ* . . . 114; *πάνυ γὰρ παρὰ τοῦτ'*, *οὐχ ὁρᾷς*; *γέγονεν τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, εἰ τοῦτὶ τὸ ῥῆμ'*, *ἀλλὰ μὴ τοῦτὶ διελέχθην ἐγώ*, *ἣ δευρὶ τὴν χεῖρ'*, *ἀλλὰ μὴ δευρὶ παρήνευγα* 232; *ἐδίδασκες γράμματα'*, *ἐγὼ δ'* *ἐφείπων* 265. It is hard to defend elision in cases like these; if the pause is sufficient to warrant the printed sign, it is certainly sufficient (in Demosthenic prose) to neutralize the hiatus.

Friedrich Schiller has recently put forth the hypothesis that in a considerable number of cases where the reading of S has hiatus that is avoided by the readings of other MSS the reading of S is correct, the others going back to a text that had been corrected by an editor for the express purpose of removing hiatus, but without an exact understanding of Demosthenes' usage ("Zu dem Hiate bei Demosthenes," *Festschrift d. Gymnas. zu Hirschberg*, 1912). The whole question needs a more thorough investigation. Zander's collection of cases of hiatus (*Eurythmia*, Leipzig, 1910, pp. 429-38) is useful.

As to Demosthenes' avoidance of *breves* there is no common consent among scholars. (I use the term *breves* in the restricted sense in which Blass has made it familiar, a group of three or more short syllables not immediately followed by a pause, and not lying entirely within a single word, unless the final syllable of the word is the final syllable of the group.) Is this avoidance of *breves* a "law" of Demosthenes' composition, a "rule" with more or less exceptions, or a mere tendency (perhaps almost unconscious)? Blass gave it such weight that he did not hesitate to adopt an inferior reading, and sometimes to alter the text outright, to avoid *breves*. Here, as in the case of hiatus, there are two classes of possible alterations: the first are merely formal, where the group of *breves* may be broken up by the elision of a vowel, by the use of *ν* movable before a consonant, by aphaeresis, or the substitution of one form of a given word for another (e.g., *εἵνεκα* for *ἐνεκα*, *χρῆν* for *ἐχρῆν*, *τοσοῦτ[ο]* for *τοσοῦτον*, *αὐτοῦ* for *ἐαυτοῦ*, *ἡβουλόμην* for *ἐβουλόμην*, *μον* for *ἐμοῦ*). Punctuation also will very often break up an apparent group of short syllables. Here it is often a question whether the pause that is clearly sufficient to lengthen the last syllable of a group is strong enough to warrant the use of a comma. This is particularly true when, as so often in the orators, the pause is rhetorical rather than syntactical; not infrequently the balance of *kola* or even of *kommata* demands so distinct a pause in delivery that it may well be marked for the eye of the reader. The rhetorical structure is so essential to the appreciation of a Greek speech that we may well use punctuation more freely than in other prose. Perhaps Blass, in his constant anxiety to avoid *breves*, punctuated too freely, but certainly Fuhr

goes too far in his reaction against this; in Fuhr's text we too often find apparent *breves* that would be broken up by a comma which is well justified on rhetorical, sometimes on syntactical, grounds. In this respect Humphreys gives the better text, avoiding both extremes, but usually alert for the removal of needless *breves*.

Fuhr's scrupulous use of elision to avoid hiatus keeps his text free from one class of needless *breves* that abound in Goodwin's text; e.g., Goodwin has πεπραγμένα ἐμαντῶ 4; τε ιδίου 8; κοινὰ ὑπέρειν 10; ἐνδέδειχθε ἐπὶ 10; πράγματα ἐλέγχους 15; ὅσα ὑπέρ 17; ἃ τότε ὀνομάζοντο 46; ἑωρᾶτο ὑπὸ 93. But in the use of *ν* movable Fuhr sometime disregards the question of *brr.*, often following the reading of S, though he admits that in this respect S has no authority. Blass had, by an entirely legitimate use of *-ν*, removed a host of apparent *breves*; some of these reappear in Fuhr's text; so ἀπέκτεινέ με δικαίως 101; τοῖς γ' ὀμωμοκόσι κατὰ τοὺς 121; τετελενηκόσι παρ' αὐτά 285; ἀνέθηκε δύναμιν 290. More numerous are the cases where *breves* are caused by Fuhr's use of *-ν* to avoid hiatus, where he should have elided: ἐστιν ὁ τὰ θηβαίων 41; γέγονεν αἷτια 42; παρελήλυθεν ὁ τῶν 48; ἐπραττεν ἀδικῶν 69; γέγονεν οἶδα 70; ἐκβέβηκεν ἃ προείπατε 80; γέγραφεν οὐτοσί 223. In all these cases Humphreys avoids the *brr.* by elision, but both Humphreys and Fuhr fail to elide in the following: ἔτυχεν ἦν 130; προσέταξεν ἐτέρῳ 135; ἐπραξεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 139; ἐποίησεν ἀπολέσθαι 142; ἐτύγγαυεν ἔχον 174; γέγονεν οἶον 198. In the following cases Fuhr makes right use of *-ν* (in each case following S) to avoid *brr.*, where Humphreys neglects it: Ἀμφικτύουσιν καί 147; Ἀμφικτύουσιν δόξαντα 156; οὖσιν μερίδι 176; εἶχεν τὸ φρόνημ' 206; κατῴρωσεν δι' ἐμοῦ 285. Butcher is very careful in this matter; the only oversights that I have noticed are ἔλεγε περί 111 (where S has ἔλεγεν περι), and Ἀμφικτύοσι καί 147.

In the choice of an alternative form of a word for the sake of avoiding *brr.* Fuhr seems to be indifferent, content to follow the reading of S. So he frequently writes ἔνεκα where Butcher and Humphreys change to εἵνεκα; e.g., δήποθ' ἔνεκα 21; μὲν ἔνεκ' ἂν εἰκότως 160; οὐπὲρ ἔνεκα τὰς 163; τίνας ἔνεκα ταῦτ' 172. So 173, 211, 248, 293. Fuhr writes ἀλλὰ τί ἐχρῆν 28, where Blass avoids the *brr.* by writing χρῆν. So the same phrase in 69, where Humphreys follows Blass in writing χρῆν. Fuhr has needless *brr.* in ἐκείνον ὑφ' ἑαντῶ (αὐτῶ Bl., Hs.) 40; Ἑλλήσποντον ὑφ' ἑαντῶ (αὐτῶ Bl., Br., Hs.) 71; καταφεύγοντας ἐφ' ἑαυτούς (αὐτούς Bl.) 97. In 64 Fuhr writes πόλιν ἐβούλετ' ἂν (ἡβούλετ' Bl.). In 52 πότερον ὑμῶν is well changed to πότερ' ὑμῶν by Bl. and Hs., though Humphreys fails, with Fuhr, to make the same change in πότερον αὐτῆν ([αὐτῆν] Bl.) 63.

It is clear in all these instances that Fuhr has not enough confidence in the theory that Demosthenes generally avoids *breves* to warrant making even formal changes in the text of S; he thus takes a reactionary position as compared with that of Butcher and Humphreys. This seems hardly consistent with his words in the preface (p. xxvi), "Brevium autem syllabarum

frequentationem Demosthenem fugisse Blassius ille quidem optime demonstravit . . .” That, as Fuhr says, it is likely that Demosthenes sometimes did use *breves* intentionally, “ut vivacior fieret oratio et incitatio,” remains to be proved—I know of no evidence of it. Certainly in the “lively” narrative of the Elateia passage in the *Crown Speech* there is no case of *breves* (168–70 inclusive), but in the emphatic discussion of the significance of the events, which immediately follows, there are more cases than is usual in the same number of lines; exactly the opposite of what Fuhr would lead us to expect.

In many cases the removal of *breves* would involve more than formal changes in the text. Here undoubtedly Fuhr is right, with Butcher and Humphreys, in refusing to follow Blass in emending the text in order to remove the *breves*; and until we have a much-needed investigation of the range of Demosthenes’ avoidance of *breves*, Fuhr and the other editors since Blass are right in refusing to give weight to this consideration even in deciding between variant readings of the MSS. On the whole, Humphreys has given us the text that most closely conforms to what we actually know about Demosthenes’ avoidance of *breves*; Butcher comes next.

Fuhr, with Butcher and Humphreys, rightly refuses to give any weight to considerations of “Demosthenic rhythm” in establishing the text. The whole question is an open one; it is doubtful whether any one of the theories that have been offered in recent years furnishes even the first step toward a solution.

I have dwelt at length on these formal characteristics of the new Teubner text because it is in this field that Fuhr has departed entirely from some of the principles of his predecessor. Turning to the question of Fuhr’s attitude toward the manuscript tradition in essential matters, we find him in substantial agreement with all recent editors; he is even more conservative than Butcher, seldom rejecting a reading of S that can possibly be retained. He uses brackets in the text very cautiously, usually on safe grounds; the larger number of his brackets are based on the conjectures of other scholars. Fuhr introduces few conjectures of his own. The critical notes contain rather more material than those of the Oxford text.

CHARLES D. ADAMS

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

Inscriptiones Graecae. By O. KERN. Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1913. M. 6.

In publishing this selection of photographic reproductions, Kern has in mind those students of Greek epigraphy who read the pages of Dittenberger’s *Sylloge* without having any idea of the appearance of the documents in their original state. Unfortunately many of the photographs which he had secured could not be used. This probably accounts for the lack of propor-